

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 22 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite and Claims 16-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Hastings. New Claim 32 has been added and thus, Claims 16-32 remain active.

Considering first then the rejection of Claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, it is to be noted that antecedent basis for the term “the stop” in line 2 of Claim 22 is found in Claim 17 of the present application. It is therefore submitted that Claims 22 and 23 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §112.

Considering next then the rejection of Claims 16-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Hastings, it is to be noted that Claim 16 and Claim 31 have now both been amended so as to state that the frame has first and second carrying arms articulated on the frame by axis of articulation, the first carrying arm being connected to a first side of the frame and the second carrying arm being connected to a second side of the frame opposite the first side wherein at least one of the first and second carrying arms comprise a latching mechanism configured to connect the first carrying arm to the second carrying arm and to lock the first and second carrying arms to one another in the transport position. As can be appreciated from a review of the above-noted language and Figure 3 of the present application, the claimed invention is unlike the agricultural implement of Hastings which has first and second carrying arms 12, 13 connected to a frame 11 but wherein the first and second carrying arms 12, 13 do not have latching mechanisms to connect them together. Moreover, wing sections 16, 17, while being connectable to first and second carrying arms 12, 13, respectively, do not meet Applicants’ claimed limitations. Moreover, neither carrying arm 12 nor carrying arm 13 can be correctly interpreted as comprising a frame as claimed in accordance with the present invention that has first and second carrying arms articulated


thereto. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that each of Claims 16 and 32 merit indication of allowability with the same being hereby respectfully requested. In addition, none of the references of record meet or disclose the above-noted limitations.

Each of Claims 17-30 contain additional limitations which, it is submitted, have no corresponding teaching or disclosure in Hastings or any of the remaining references of record. It is therefore submitted that such claims also merit indication of allowability.

Applicants further note that new Claim 32 has been added so as to more broadly claim an agricultural implement having agricultural tools connected thereto but which otherwise is similar in language to that of Claim 16. Accordingly, it is submitted that Claim 32 also merits indication of allowability with the same being hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
JDH/rac

I:\ATTY\JDH\259406US-AM.DOC

James D. Hamilton  
Registration No. 28,421